

REMARKS

Claims 16, 26, and 36 have been amended. Claims 17 and 27 have been cancelled.
Claims 16, 18-26, and 28 - 36 are under examination.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On September 24, the Examiner, Joiya M. Cloud, and the Applicants' representative, Ronald M. Pomerence conducted a telephonic interview. A proposed amendment to Claim 16 was discussed in view of the art on record. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment to Claim 16 appeared to overcome the art on record.

REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 16-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Green* et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,517,494 ("*Green*") in view of *Schultz*, U.S. Patent No. 5,640,553, ("*Schultz*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Amended Independent Claim 16 recites:

A processing agent for processing data at a node in a data network, wherein the data network connects a plurality of nodes and at least a portion of the plurality of the nodes form a multicast group, the processing agent comprising:

a data store that is operable to store a plurality of entries associated with the multicast group, wherein each entry identifies a source that published the entry;

logic that is operable to disseminate the plurality of entries to members of the multicast group;

logic that is operable to receive, from a node that is not a member of the multicast group, a request to run a query, wherein the query specifies matching criteria;
logic that is operable to run the query against the entries in the data store; and
logic that is operable to disseminate one or more entries that satisfy the matching criteria to the node that is not a member of the multicast group (emphasis added).

Neither *Green* nor *Schultz*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above claim limitations.

The Applicants have amended Claim 16 as they proposed to the Examiner prior to the Examiner interview. Because the Examiner indicated that the proposed claim amendment appeared to overcome the art of record, Claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 26 and 36 contain similar limitations as those discussed in response to the rejection of Claim 16. Therefore, Claims 26 and 36 are allowable.

The remaining dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on their incorporation of limitations from the Independent claims, as well as additional limitations that distinguish over cited art.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to pay any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: October 15, 2007

/RonaldMPomerence#43009/

Ronald M. Pomerence
Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, #550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080, ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076